

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Appl. No. 09/778,553

Amdt. dated September 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 42 were pending in the application at the time of examination. The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 29, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by the Krause et al. reference (US 5,757,372). The Examiner rejected Claims 4 to 14, 18 to 28 and 32 to 42 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as obvious over the Krause et al. reference (US 5,757,372).

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 15 and 29. Consequently, Claims 1 to 42 remain in the Application.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 29, 30 AND 31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 29, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by the Krause et al. reference (US 5,757,372).

The Examiner has previously stated, with emphasis added:

Regarding independent claims 1, 15, and 29, Krause discloses **identifying a plurality of events, storing a plurality of states associated with the document upon the occurrence of the plurality of events**, and obtaining the desired state using the plurality of states in col.1, lines 42-59 and col.2 lines 6-10.

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 15 and 29. In particular, Claim 1, as amended, recites, with emphasis added:

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Appl. No. 09/778,553

Amdt. dated September 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2005

A method for obtaining a desired state of a document comprising:

identifying a plurality of events;

automatically storing a plurality of states associated with said document in response to the occurrence of said plurality of events;

and obtaining said desired state using said plurality of states.

Claim 15, as amended, recites, with emphasis added:

A document versioning system comprising:

an event identifier configured to identify a plurality of events;

a state device configured to automatically store a plurality of states associated with a document in response to the occurrence of said plurality of events; and

a version obtainer configured to obtain said desired state using said plurality of states.

Claim 29, as amended, recites, with emphasis added:

A computer program product comprising:

a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied therein configured to obtain a desired state of a document, said computer program product comprising:

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Appl. No. 09/778,553

Amdt. dated September 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2005

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to identify a plurality of events;

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to automatically store a plurality of states associated with said document in response to the occurrence of said plurality of events; and

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to obtain said desired state using said plurality of states.

As seen above, each of Applicants' independent Claims 1, 15 and 29, as amended, recites **automatically storing a plurality of states associated with said document in response to the occurrence of said plurality of events**, or words to the same effect. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 15 and 29 is found throughout Applicants' Specification as filed including page 10, lines 1 to 4 and page 14, lines 11 to 18.

Applicants' respectfully submit that the amendments to Claims 1, 15 and 29 simply clarify and re-state features inherent in the invention as disclosed and the original Claims as filed. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to Claims 1, 15 and 29 do not introduce new matter or new issues, nor do the amendments necessitate a new search or define a new scope of the invention.

Applicants again respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's statement that Krause teaches storing a plurality of states associated with the document **upon the occurrence of the plurality of events**, Krause specifically teaches that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question.

Column 1, lines 42 to 59, of Krause, cited by the Examiner, reads as follows, with emphasis added:

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Appl. No. 09/778,553

Amdt. dated September 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2005

If multiple undo capability is provided, then the document proceeds through its prior states in a linear manner. Similarly, when changes are saved by version number, the user can usually easily only get back to the immediately prior version. If multiple versions are saved, then the user must execute a command which causes a list of prior versions to be displayed from which the user can select one prior version to open to replace the current version stored in volatile memory.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

A method and an apparatus are disclosed for saving prior versions of a document so that the user has complete control of which versions of the document are saved, while providing a mechanism for easy retrieval of saved versions. The invention utilizes a set of icons on a screen display which when selected by a pointer device perform an action depending upon the state of the selected icon which may be one of three states.

Column 2, lines 6 to 10, of Krause, cited by the Examiner, reads as follows, with emphasis added:

A method and apparatus are disclosed which provide a mechanism for enabling **a user of a computer program to save multiple versions** of a document being worked on such that the current version can be easily saved and prior versions can be easily and selectively retrieved.

In addition, Column 2, lines 11 to 16, of Krause reads as follows, with emphasis added:

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Appl. No. 09/778,553

Amdt. dated September 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2005

The mechanism is implemented as a computer program which displays a set of icons on a display device, which icons, when selected by a user by operation of a pointing device, cause a predetermined action to be taken with respect to the image currently displayed on the visual display. The image being displayed may represent any kind of a document such as a scanned picture in a bitmapped format, a word processing document, a spreadsheet document or any other type of document which may be represented on a computer screen.

Column 2, lines 35 to 39, of Krause reads as follows, with emphasis added:

The buttons or dots 15 are the icons which when selected by the user cause the current state of the document to be saved or replaced by a previously saved version of the image depending upon the state of the selected button or dot 15.

Column 3, lines 27 to 39, of Krause reads as follows, with emphasis added:

Logically, selection of dots or buttons 15 causes the following operations to be performed. If a button is in the empty state, selecting that button will cause a save operation to take place with respect to the currently displayed image and the selected button or dot will change so that it is displayed in the saved state (e.g., brown or black). If the button or dot is in the saved state when it is selected, then the displayed image is replaced with the image corresponding to the memory of the selected

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Appl. No. 09/778,553

Amdt. dated September 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2005

memory button, and the display of the selected button is changed to show a change of state to current (e.g., red or black and white pattern). If the selected button or dot is in the current state then no action is taken.

As seen above, Krause discloses that a user **must** select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question. Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's statement, Krause specifically teaches away from **automatically storing a plurality of states associated with said document in response to the occurrence of said plurality of events**, as recited in Applicants' Claims 1, 15 and 29, as amended, and instead teaches that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show that the Krause reference discloses, teaches or suggests storing a plurality of states associated with the document **automatically storing a plurality of states associated with said document in response to the occurrence of said plurality of events**, as the Examiner has stated.

In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 15 and 29, as amended, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 2 and 3 depend on Claim 1 as amended. Consequently, Claims 2 and 3 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 1, as amended. Claims 16 and 17 depend on Claim 15 as amended. Consequently, Claims 16 and 17 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 15, as amended. Claims 30 and 31 depend on Claim 29 as amended. Consequently, Claims 30 and 31 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 29, as amended. In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Appl. No. 09/778,553

Amdt. dated September 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2005

rejection of Claims 2 and 3, Claims 16 and 17 and Claims 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4 TO 14, 18 TO 28 and 32 TO 42 under 35 U.S.C.103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 4 to 14, 18 to 28 and 32 to 42 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as obvious over the Krause et al. reference (US 5,757,372).

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Krause discloses that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question. Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's statement, Krause specifically teaches away from **automatically storing a plurality of states associated with said document in response to the occurrence of said plurality of events**, and instead teaches that a user must select a button or icon in order to save the state of the document in question. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show that the Krause reference discloses, teaches or suggests storing a plurality of states associated with the document **automatically storing a plurality of states associated with said document in response to the occurrence of said plurality of events**, as the Examiner has stated.

Claims 4 to 14 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 1, as amended. Consequently, Claims 4 to 14 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 1. Claims 18 to 28 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 15, as amended. Consequently, Claims 18 to 28 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 15, as amended. Claims 32 to 42 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 29, as amended. Consequently, Claims 32 to 42 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 29,

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Appl. No. 09/778,553

Amdt. dated September 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2005

as amended. In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 4 to 14, Claims 18 to 28 and Claims 32 to 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 21, 2005.


Attorney for Applicants

September 21, 2005
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Philip J. McKay
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,966
Tel.: (831) 655-0880